



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/479,913	01/10/2000	Cory E. Klatt	4944.85640	3689

7590

09/16/2003

Banner & Witcoff Ltd
1001 G Street NW
Washington, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER

PHAM, THIERRY L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/479,913

Applicant(s)

KLATT ET AL.

Examiner

Thierry L Pham

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

-DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 2 & 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification does not provide an adequate written description for “new contact added to the sales management system and a contact rising to a new status level” as recited in claims 2 & 8, therefore, it would not enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make/use, and practice of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6330542 to Sevcik et al (hereafter Sevcik). Sevcik discloses a method of designating event rules comprising the steps of: (1) providing a first display region allowing selection of items (postcards, Figure 7) that contains information from a sales management database (the automated Internet quoting and procurement system described herein features a series of graphical interfaces which represent various printed products that are linked to a database of prices and

Art Unit: 2624

other variable options from various print providers, col. 3, lines 24-28); (2) providing a second display region allowing selection of events (pull down menus for several variable options for postcards printing such as quantity, Figure 7, col. 6, lines 27-38) that may occur in said sales management database; (3) receiving user designation of one of said items (postcards, Figure 7); (4) receiving user designation of one of said events (requesting of 2500 postcards to be printed, Figure 7); (4) wherein a print order regarding said designated item is generated upon detection of said designated event (if all the conditions are met, then the buyers can generate a print order by clicking "Yes, I'm Sure" as shown in Figure 7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6529214 to Chase et al (hereafter Chase), and to U.S. Patent No. 6330542 to Sevcik et al (hereafter Sevcik).

Regarding claim 1, Chase discloses a method and system for an interactive print job display comprising: an input device (keyboard 24, Figure 1) for receiving user input; a processor (Computer, Figure 1) for receiving a user input selecting item (article, col. 4, lines 3-7); a storage (database 54, Figure 2) for storing an event rule (text, font, and layout, col. 4, lines 3-10) relating

Art Unit: 2624

said selected event and said selected item wherein, upon occurrence of said selected event, a print order relating to said item is generated (Order Now, col. 6, lines 39-41).

However, Chase does not disclose expressly a display having a first display region displaying an item to be printed and a second display region displaying a menu of events associated with said sales management databases.

Sevcik discloses an Automated Internet Quoting and Procurement System for commercial printing comprising a first display region displaying an item to be printed (postcards, Figure 7) and a second display region displaying a menu of events (pull down menus for several variable options for postcards print order such as quantity, Figure 7, col. 6, lines 27-38) associated with said sales management database (the automated Internet quoting and procurement system described herein features a series of graphical interfaces which represent various printed products that are linked to a database of prices and other variable options from various print providers, col. 3, lines 24-28).

Chase and Sevcik are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor for generating print orders. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add a first display region for displaying an item to be printed, and a second display region for displaying menu of events, as per teachings of Sevcik. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would save the buyers and providers significant time in having to prepare a quote (col. 1, lines 19-21 of Sevcik). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sevcik with Chase to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Art Unit: 2624

2. Regarding claims 3-5, Sevcik further discloses the computer system for designating rules further comprising: a third display region displaying where the output of a print order is to be sent to: a sales contact, a salesperson associated with a sales contact (Delivery Address, Figure 7). Figure 7 also shows an example of a postcard print order is to be shipped to a customer with a specific address. This option allows the provider to ship the product to any address, which includes a sale contact, a salesperson associated with a sales contact.

3. Regarding claim 6, Sevcik further discloses the computer system for designating rules wherein the items relate to different versions of sales packets (postcards, envelopes, letterheads, Figure 2, col. 6, lines 18-23).

4. Claims 2 & 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chase and Sevcik as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hedloy (U.S. 6323853). The references from Chase and Sevcik as described from claim 1 above, which do not disclose expressly the computer system for designating rules, wherein second display region includes at least one event chosen from a new contact added to the sales management system database and a contact rising to a new status level.

Hedloy discloses a computer system (Fig. 16) for designating rules, wherein a display region includes at least one event chose from a new contact added (Fig. 6) to the sales management database (information management source, such as database, file, database program, contact management program, col. 3, lines 36-56) and a contact rising to a new status level (Adding a New Contact to the Database, col. 6, lines 5-19).

Art Unit: 2624


Chase, Sevcik, and Hedloy are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor for computer system for designating rules from events occurring on a sales management database. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine a display region that includes at least one event chosen from a new contact added to the sales management database as per teachings of Hedloy for the display region of Chase and Sevcik. The suggestion/motivation for doing so is to provide greater operating efficiencies for print providers, thereby allowing the printing providers to lower pricing without making any sacrifices in profit margin (col. 3, lines 5-17 of Sevcik). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chase and Sevcik with Hedloy to obtain the invention as specified in claims 2 & 8.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thierry L Pham whose telephone number is (703) 305-1897. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30 AM - 5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K Moore can be reached on (703)308-7452. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Thierry L. Pham


Sept. 8, 2003

DAVID MOORE
SUPERVISOR
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600